

Appl. No. 10/698,871
Atty. Docket No. 9084M
Amdt. dated Nov. 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of Aug. 14, 2006
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 14 2006

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-22 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claim 6 is canceled.

Claims 1, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 21 have been amended to recite that a cationic deposition polymer aggregated with said perfume polymeric. Support for the amendment is found in original Claim 6.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103

The Office Action states that Claims 1-9 and 12-22 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 925,776. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. EP 925,776 does not teach or suggest all of limitations of Claims 1, 16, 18, 19, and 20; therefore, the reference does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (see MPEP 2143.03). Specifically, EP 925,776 does not teach or suggest a personal care composition comprising a cationic deposition polymer aggregated with a perfume polymeric particle. Thus, EP 925,776 does not provide motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art the motivated to formulate a personal care composition comprising a cationic deposition polymer aggregated with the perfume polymeric particle. Therefore, EP 925,776 does not teach or suggest, a water insoluble perfume polymeric particle described in Claims 1, 16, 18, 19 and 20, therefore, the claimed invention it is unobvious. The Applicants respectfully request that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-22 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By Bridget Murray
Bridget Murray
Registration No. 52,555
(513) 626-0575

November 14, 2006
Customer No. 27752